

REMARKS:

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated October 1, 2010. Claims 2-5, 10, 20, 28, and 29 are pending in the present application and claims 1, 6-9, 11-19, and 21-27 have been canceled. The Office Action has rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action has further rejected claims 1, 3-5, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,018,847 to Lu (hereinafter “Lu”). The Office Action has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,970,580 to Katoh (hereinafter “Katoh”). Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 812,368 to Chen et al. (hereinafter “Chen”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,981 to Kuivas et al. (hereinafter “Kuivas”). Additionally, the Office Action has rejected Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Japanese Patent Application No. 2002-297574A. Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has not rejected Claims 10 or 20 and indicates that they would be given favorable consideration if rewritten in independent form including all of the recitations of the claim that they depend from and any intervening claims.

The Rejection of Claims 10 and 20

As noted above, the Examiner indicated that Claims 10 and 20 would be given favorable consideration if rewritten in independent form including all of the recitations of the claim that they depend from and any intervening claims. Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of independent Claim 1 and intervening Claims 7, 8, and 9. The prior rejections of Claims 1, 7, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112 have been addressed in amended Claim 10. In particular, regarding the 112 rejection of Claim 1, the rejected subject matter has been deleted. Claim 7 had been rejected as it was unclear how the “three hinge elements” were related to the “two hinge elements.” Claim 10 now recites “two hinge elements” and a “third hinge element.”

Claim 8 had been rejected for similar reasons as Claim 7. Claim 10 recites “two hinge elements, each comprising an arm with a boss” and “a third hinge element comprises a boss defining a through hole” thereby overcoming the rejection of Claim 8. As each of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been addressed, independent Claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 20 was rejected only under 35 U.S.C. 112 as it was unclear how the “three hinge elements” were related to “at least two hinge elements.” Applicant has amended Claim 20 to recite “two hinge elements” and a “third hinge element.” Further, the geometry of the third hinge element is defined as “the third hinge element comprising a boss and a through hole” thereby clarifying the “axis of rotation” which “is perpendicular to the first axis of rotation” as claimed. The additional subject matter which was rejected has been canceled from the claim as it is not believed necessary to patentably distinguish Claim 20 over the cited art. Therefore, independent Claim 20 is in condition for allowance.

New Claims 28 and 29

New claims 28 and 29 added herein by amendment recite a mobile electronic device including a first part, a second part, and a modular hinge connecting the first and second parts. The modular hinge of Claim 28 includes first and second pairs of hinge elements, each including an arm and a boss with a through hole for receiving wiring for electronically connecting the first and second parts, the arm being rotatably mounted on said boss. An example embodiment representative of the claimed modular hinge of Claim 28 may be found in FIGS. 6 and 7. None of the cited art, alone or in combination, teach or suggest at least the claimed configuration of “a bracket comprising a cross piece and four lobes, each lobe having a circular cut out portion wherein the circular cut out portions are mounted on the outer surfaces of the bosses.”

The modular hinge of Claim 29 includes a first pair of hinge elements including an arm and a boss with a through hole for receiving wiring for electrically connecting the first and second parts, the arm being rotatably mounted on the boss. The modular hinge further including a third hinge element including a boss and a through hole. An example embodiment representative of the claimed modular hinge of Claim 29 may be found at least in FIGS. 10 and

Appl No. 10/584,001
Amendment Dated February 1, 2011
Response to Office Action of October 1, 2010

11. None of the cited art, alone or in combination, teach or suggest at least the claimed configuration of “a bracket comprising a cross piece and two lobes, each lobe and the cross piece having a circular cut out portion wherein the circular cut out portions are mounted on an outer surface of the bosses.”

For at least the reasons above, independent Claims 28 and 29 are patentably distinct from the cited art, taken alone or in combination.

Appl No. 10/584,001
Amendment Dated February 1, 2011
Response to Office Action of October 1, 2010

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 10, 20, 28, and 29, and all the claims depending therefrom (*i.e.*, Claims 2-5) are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned agent to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

The patentability of the independent claims has been argued as set forth above and thus Applicant will not take this opportunity to argue the merits of the rejection with regard to specific dependent claims. However, Applicant does not concede that the dependent claims are not independently patentable and reserves the right to argue the patentability of dependent claims at a later date if necessary.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan A. Thomas
Registration No. 62,200

CUSTOMER NO. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON February 1, 2011.